



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sults, while others, as Bacon would say, are to be "chewed and digested." In addition to all this, in the line of specific preparation, "parallel or subsidiary reading is to be encouraged," as, also, the committal to memory of "a considerable amount of English poetry."

All this is in the right direction and marks the most decided advance and promising tendency in English work. There is no better way of knowing what literature is than reading it. It is better than the study of language, good as that may be; better than the technical study of rhetorical laws and principles, good as that may be; better than the study of criticism of books. Nothing will atone for the neglect of the actual reading and much reading of the very best books, so as to know them experimentally and vitally; so as to imbibe their spirit and feel at home in their company; and, thereby, cultivate a taste and faculty by which "the best that is known and thought in the world" shall be the best to us. It is this factor and feature that American education is needing as much as it needs anything, if so be our learning is to be allied to culture, and English Literature, this side the sea, is to be worthy of its British antecedents.

As a necessary result of all this, there will follow the deepening and broadening of a genuine English literary spirit in American students. We are not referring here to the pursuit of this or that specific English study; to any specific method of English work, or to the selection of this or that English author or book, but to the inner impulse and spirit of English literature, back of all book and method, and teacher and objective end, so that we shall not only be held loyally true to the best interests of our vernacular and be able to speak the English language correctly and write it clearly, cogently and in good taste, but shall enter by training and habit into a due appreciation of its best literary products and find ourselves in fullest sympathy with every expression of good taste and with all forms of literary progress.

No amount of specifically classical training in our schools, desirable as it is, should be sufficient to lessen this English influence or impair its value. English students (whatever else they may or may not be) should be pre-eminently English in character, tone, spirit

and aspiration, and nothing will more effectually induce this desirable result than the appreciative knowledge, on the part of our American students, of the fulness and richness of English authorship. They are, in Johnsonian phrase, to "spend their days and nights" with these authors.

This Report, therefore, as it lies before us, is far more than a Report on Entrance Examinations in English. It is, in reality, a Report on English studies as a whole, calling attention to urgent needs as now existing and proposing a plan by which they may be met. In English, as elsewhere, when Secondary Instruction is properly adjusted, the higher forms and periods will be rightly adjusted, and all factors and elements coöperate towards the best ultimate result. It is one of the most hopeful signs in Modern Education that this spirit of unity and catholicity is so rapidly growing,—a real and healthful Communism in all intellectual endeavor and research. As in our colleges themselves, the old class distinctions are fast giving way to broader economy, and to the highest good of the general student body as a fraternity of scholars, so are the sharply, dividing lines between the school and the college, the Master and the Professor, fast disappearing by the very force of events and by the growing desire, on the part of all right-minded educators, to coöperate in all worthy scholastic effort, if so be our institutions of learning, higher and lower, may be what they ought to be, the most potent factor, next to the Christian Church, in the cause of truth and right.

THEODORE W. HUNT.

Princeton College.

CORNEILLE FROM 1640 to 1650.

STUDENTS of the French drama of the first half of the seventeenth century find themselves much at a loss regarding its development, owing to the great confusion recently introduced into the chronology. So long as the dates of the *Frères Parfait* remained unquestioned, absolute statements as to authors and works passed without criticism. But with the discoveries of Marty-Laveaux concerning one or two plays of Corneille, the overhauling which more recently befell Mairet's autobiog-

raphy, and the researches of Rigal into the origin and existence of the leading theaters of the time, a great uncertainty has taken the place of the former assurance, and categorical groupings of literary causes and effects have gone out of fashion. That facts are not as they were supposed to be seems the greatest gain which has been made by the discussions which have been carried on; but what new data have been determined upon does not stand out very clearly from the results tabulated. Literary histories waver woefully and—to cite the most recent, Fortier's excellent production,—there is a great lack of logical sequence in them which destroys all attempts to get an adequate conception of this most important period in the evolution of the stage.

It is not the object of this article to do much more than call attention to this curious condition of things. The great questions surrounding the later activity of Hardy, the relations of Mairat and Corneille to the new canons of tragedy, and the influence these writers may have exerted on each other are topics altogether too formidable to be approached here. But it would seem as though the hesitation over the less remote works of the last-named dramatist was no longer necessary, or at least might be hemmed in within narrower limits, and that the material at hand in the standard edition of Corneille might be utilized, even by itself, to more purpose than it has been.

The great difficulty which hedges about the whole matter is the authority granted to the dictum of the Parfaict Brothers. Because they made such or such statement,—very often without producing any supporting evidence—it appears to be held almost as a literary sin to set up new contradictory assertions. It is perhaps for this reason, for instance, that Petit de Julleville in his *'Histoire du théâtre'* puts "Polyeucte" between the dates 1641 and 1643, though the only witness known on the subject leaves no doubt as to the choice. And so, if we may be pardoned the presumption, we will proceed to consider the dates of Corneille's plays from "Horace" to "Nicomède," just as though the Parfaict Brothers had never gained their pre-eminent authority, or were only ordinary fallible mortals. With them out of the

way we will assume that the principal witnesses to be called are the editions of the plays themselves, stray letters which mention their performances, Chapelain's correspondence and Tallemant des Réaux' anecdotes. The latter to be sure had no great affection for our author, whom he characterizes constantly as avaricious, and does not dwell on his doings very willingly. And Chapelain, who kept track of the intellectual movement of his day and reported it to Balzac, in retirement in the provinces, has not been able to enlighten posterity as it could wish, for that part of his correspondence which concerns this most interesting period is lost, and only his account of the happenings during the one year of it, 1640, has been preserved.

"Horace," then, leads the second division of Corneille's plays with the date 1640. In a letter of March 9th of that year Chapelain speaks of it as a novelty, played as yet but once before the Cardinal. He adds that it must serve as a breadwinner for the actors six months before it can be printed, according to the custom of the time. (Marty-Laveaux ed. iii, p. 250). And it was not printed until Jan. 15th, 1641, nearly a year after its first performance. "Horace" was followed by "Cinna," and to the latter the date 1640 has also been assigned. But there is nothing at all in favor of this statement. On the contrary Chapelain, whose letters reach down to December of that year, does not mention it, and the privilege of its publication was not granted until August 1st, 1642, though a cession of the edition had been made to Toussaint Quinet by the 16th of June. On the other hand, we know by a Latin poem of Ménage's that "Cinna" was brought out before Corneille's marriage (*l.c.*, i, pp. xxviii-xxix). The historians, having decided that the tragedy was given in 1640, have put the dramatist's nuptials in that year. But Corneille, in a letter of July 1st, 1641, (*l.c.*, x, p. 437) speaks of his domestic life as something recent, and his first child, a daughter, was born on January 10th, 1642. Accordingly "Cinna" must have been acted as early as February, 1641, or before Lent of that year, and Corneille's marriage may also have taken place before Ash Wednesday. The fact that Ménage's poem was on the supposed death of the dramatist

from pneumonia on the first night of his honeymoon may indicate somewhat the season of the year. From all the evidence, negative though it is, I am inclined to place the date of "Cinna" between December, 1640, and March, 1641, and rather after December than otherwise, owing to Chapelain's silence on the subject.

The next play in order is the one responsible for all the doubtings which have affected the chronology of this decade, "Polyeucte." Until Marty-Laveaux had reached his tenth volume, all authorities had overlooked the plain passage in a letter to Corneille, written December 12th, 1643, by Claude Sarrau, from Paris. Sarrau refers to Richelieu's death and says that he hopes that Corneille is to "add a fourth to his three other divine and excellent dramas." He hears that he is working on a "sacred poem" and wishes to hear whether it is "well under way—or even finished" (*l.c.*, x, pp. 438-40). The three "dramas" Sarrau thus praises must be the "Cid," "Horace" and "Cinna," while the "sacred poem" is as clearly "Polyeucte." Furthermore, Balzac, acknowledging in a letter of January 17th, 1643, the receipt of the printed "Horace" and "Cinna," makes no mention of "Polyeucte," which he could hardly have failed to do had it been brought out in Paris many days before he wrote (*l.c.*, x, pp. 440-2). From these two witnesses it would look as though "Polyeucte" must have been put on the boards after the New Year's festivities or not earlier than the 10th of January, 1643. That it was given in this month, or in the following February, seems quite certain from a passage in Tallemant des Réaux. He says: "Depuis la mort du Cardinal, M. de Schomberg lui (Louis XIII) dit que Corneille voulait lui dédier la tragédie de Polyeucte. Cela lui fit peur, parceque Montauron avait donné deux cents pistoles à Corneille pour Cinna." ('Historiettes' II, p. 93). Tallemant is a reliable witness, and this conversation could not have taken place before the last days of January, 1643—when "Cinna" was published—nor after Lent of the same year, for Louis died on May 14th and had been but lingering on the edge of the grave for some months. Indeed his fate was considered sealed after a relapse which happened on

February 21st, 1643. Consequently "Polyeucte" may safely be placed between January 1st and March 1st, 1643.

Next in order comes "Pompée" (or "la Mort de Pompée") which Corneille declares was written to satisfy those who did not find the verses of "Polyeucte" as powerful as those of "Cinna." This is equivalent to saying that "Pompée" was not begun until the critics had pronounced upon "Polyeucte," or after March 1643. But on the same page (*l.c.*, iv, p. 130) we read that "le menteur" and "Pompée" had been given out by the same hand, both of them, in the same winter. The word "given out" (my rendering for the original "*parties*") must refer to their production on the stage and not to their composition in the study. For "Pompée" (or "la Mort de Pompée") was known to the public before the end of 1643, and a proof of this statement is furnished by Corneille himself. In a petition addressed to the young king, Louis XIV, and dated 1643 without day or month, he asks that the king should give him a copyright of "Cinna," "Polyeucte" and "la Mort de Pompée." This petition was denied, nor does it appear by its contents that "Pompée" had been publicly performed; for Corneille, after using the indicative mood in speaking of the composition of the three, changes to the conditional and even to the future perfect, when he speaks of their representation (*l.c.*, p. lxxiv-v). But we know that the first two had been given long before, and "Polyeucte" made public property by its publication at the end of October, 1643, as "Cinna" had been since January. Consequently a possible supposition from the change of tenses would be that Corneille had not yet given "Pompée" to his actors and was trying to get for them the exclusive right in advance. At all events the privilege to print it was issued January 22nd, 1644, and the final proof drawn February 16th. Inasmuch as Chapelain had asserted but four years previously that the actors had six months to profit by their plays before their publication, it would be quite safe to say that "Pompée" first saw the light in the autumn of 1643. The illness and death of the king would have prevented the production of any new piece in the spring preceding, and the absence of any mention

of "le menteur" in our author's petition would go to show that the winter referred to above was the winter of 1643-44.

How long after "Pompée" the expectant Parisians awaited "le menteur" we have no means of determining. The privilege of publication was included in the copyright issued for "Pompée" (January 22nd, 1644) and the comedy must have been put on the stage by that date, or at least have been ready for acting. Yet, as it was not printed until the last day of October in the same year, it is evident that the success which accompanied its performance continued during the winter and spring of its appearance. If "Pompée" was given in October or November of 1643, it is hardly possible that "le menteur" was brought out before the beginning of 1644.

In the "Épître" which prefaced the edition of "le menteur" Corneille hints that he has in view another play of the same sort, and during the next season "la suite du menteur" was acted before the public of the Marais theater. Its author confesses himself that it obtained very little applause, and no reference to it is found among the literary notes of the time. The comedy could hardly have appeared before December, 1644—judging from the words regarding it in the "Épître" of "le menteur." It was printed at Rouen in September, 1645, and consequently was an old story by that time. So the approximate date of December, 1644, to March, 1645, would seem to be safe for the light run of "la suite," to which Corneille testifies in the following September.

The play which should come next in order on the list is still open to doubt. All the editions, but one, which Corneille gave of his own works place "Théodore" before "Rodogune." Pellisson, writing in 1653, reverses this relative position, as does Fontenelle in his "Vie de Corneille," composed so many years later. The critics have sided with these two authorities (Marty-Laveaux ed. iv, pp. 399-400), assume that Corneille put "Théodore" first because it was printed before "Rodogune." Some little light may also be derived from Fontenelle's explanation of his uncle's fondness for "Rodogune" on account of the length of time he had spent on it ("car il fut

plus d'un an à disposer du sujet"). Further than all this, it seems quite undeniable that Gilbert's "Rodogune," which was published in February, 1646, and consequently must have been acted the previous autumn at the latest (the authorities place it in 1644 without any evidence to support them), actually knew of Corneille's work in manuscript—which was not difficult to do, as the latter was in the habit of reading his compositions beforehand to literary friends—and tried to forestall it with the public.

If Corneille was occupied for more than a year with the plan and composition of "Rodogune," as Fontenelle positively states, the period of its inception must be carried back to the months which followed the production of "Pompée" and "le menteur," or the summer of 1644. Possibly the success of the idea of bringing out close together a tragedy and a comedy induced him to make a second trial and have "Rodogune" a pendant to "la suite du menteur." But the difficulties attending the evolution of the former and the cold reception accorded to the latter may have delayed him unnecessarily, and postponed "Rodogune" until the autumn of 1645. This hesitation was taken advantage of by Gilbert as we have seen. If "Rodogune" then was ready for the actors by October, 1645, our dramatist would have his hands free to prepare a tragedy of the same class as "Polyeucte," and the first weeks of the New Year would witness the performance of "Théodore." But the latter fell flat and the actors soon returned it to its author. In the "Épître," which prefaces the edition of "Théodore" (October 31st, 1646), Corneille speaks of its short career as though the date were quite recent. The privilege however had been granted the previous April, and if "Théodore" was not acted till 1646 it undoubtedly appeared before Lent of that year.

The "Avertissement" in the edition of "Rodogune" (January 31st, 1647) gives the approximate date of "Héraclius" and puts that tragedy shortly before the beginning of 1647, or close after it, as Marty-Laveaux has sufficiently indicated (*l. c.*, v., pp. 115 ff.). Scarcely was it out of the way when the court gave Corneille an order for a musical comedy,

or an opera. The subject he chose was the rescue of Andromeda by Perseus, and the title he gave the play was "Andromède." It was to be ready for the carnival of 1648. But the recovery of the young king from the small-pox, in the last months of 1647, was followed by an attack of piety at the court, and before this malady died away the Fronde came to put a stop to all public diversions. Not until August, 1649, did the theaters come to life again, to find Corneille forehanded with a petition for the copyright of his opera, which was granted in October of the same year. Reliable testimony shows that it was finally given in January, 1650, and our poet was at length rewarded for his patience. (*Z. c.*, v, pp. 245, ff.).

But he had not been idle in the meantime. Both Pellisson and Fontenelle place "Don Sanche d'Aragon" before "Andromède" in their list of Corneille's works, and Pellisson, who wrote but three years later, could not have been mistaken, though Fontenelle may have been. Marty-Laveaux, who accepts their statements in the question of "Rodogune" vs. "Théodore," respects in this instance the order which Corneille always observed in the successive editions of his plays. The privilege to publish "Don Sanche" was granted at the same time with the privilege for "Andromède," on April 11th, 1650, and the former was immediately printed (May 14th, 1650), the latter, however, not until August, 1651. But "Don Sanche" was not a success though it was well received at first. This fact undoubtedly hastened its publication. If, as Pellisson and Fontenelle affirm, it comes before "Andromède" in the order of production, it must have been brought out not later than the first days of January, 1650. Yet it is hardly possible that even so popular a dramatist would be allowed to monopolize two theaters in the same month, and it seems much more plausible to consider "Don Sanche" as given to the public by November of the preceding year, which indeed would be entirely admissible, for the protracted troubles of the Fronde must have given its author ample leisure to not only perfect "Andromède," but also to prepare another play against the re-establishment of peace and the revival of theater-going.

The remaining drama of this second period of Corneille's activity, about which there is chronological uncertainty, is "Nicomède." Though—according to the author, who was remarkable for his capability of telling the truth about himself—it met with considerable success, it is not mentioned by the writers of the day whose records are open to us. The only guide to its approximate date is afforded by the privilege to print granted on March 12th, 1651, from which we may conjecture that it was first given in January or February of that year, inasmuch as the weeks following the New Year's festivities and preceding Lent were the most favorable for the run of plays. We also know that "Andromède" was ordered for Carnival time, and "Pertharite," which followed "Nicomède" a year later, was brought out at the same season of merry-making. Corneille was now the author most in renown and accordingly could choose his own time for the performance of his plays.

To sum up what we have gleaned from the various documents published by Marty-Laveaux and the hints of Tallemant, we are inclined to submit as approximate dates for this section of Corneille's plays, in their order: "Horace," February, 1640; "Cinna," December, 1640—February, 1641; "Polyeucte," January—February, 1643; "Pompée," October, 1643—January, 1644; "le Menteur," January—February, 1644; "la Suite du Menteur," December, 1644—February, 1645; "Rodogune," November—December, 1645; "Théodore," January—February, 1646; "Héraclius," December, 1646—January, 1647; "Don Sanche," November—December, 1649; "Andromède," January, 1650; "Nicomède," January—February, 1651.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

DEEDS, NOT YEARS.

BARTLETT, in his 'Familiar Quotations,' ninth edition, p. 443, has collected several literary variations on the above theme. I quote:

"A life spent worthily should be measured by a nobler line,—by deeds, not years,"
[SHERIDAN]: 'Pizarro,' Act iv, Sc. 1.